

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the application and for courtesies extended during the telephone interviews.

#### **Status of Office Action**

At the outset, the Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004, is responsive to communications filed on August 24, 2004 and not August 4, 2004 as indicated by the Examiner. In addition, the Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner has not indicated whether the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004 is final or non-final. Because the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004 was responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed August 24, 2004, the Applicant believes that the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004 is non-final. The Applicant's belief is based on Applicant's understanding of Patent Office procedure governed by MPEP § 706.07(h). If Applicant's belief is incorrect, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-5 and 10-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 and 10-32 are pending in this application. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 15. Claims 29-32 have been cancelled by this reply.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that he has reviewed the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 27, 2001, by returning an initialed copy of the corresponding PTO-1449 Form.

**Objection to Drawings**

The Applicant respectfully notes that formal drawings filed on January 27, 2004, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate whether the filed formal drawings are acceptable.

**Double Patenting**

In response the Office Action mailed October 27, 2003, the Applicant submitted, pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion, a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection with respect to claims 1, 10, 15, and 17. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate whether the filed terminal disclaimer is acceptable to overcome the double patenting rejection with respect to claims 1, 10, 15, and 17.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claims 1-5 and 10-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated Oracle 7 Administrator's Guide, Release 7.3, February 1996 (hereafter "Oracle"). With respect to the rejection, claims 29-32 are cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, the rejection is moot with respect to the cancelled claims. In addition, independent claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended by this reply to clarify the invention. In particular, independent claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended to clarify that a Class of Service (CoS) scheme includes a CoS definition entry and a CoS template entry. Further, the CoS template entry includes at least one attribute value, which may be used by CoS Logic to provide the attribute value to a target entry. In addition, the target entry is within a scope of a parent of the CoS definition entry. Dependent claims have been amended to be consistent with amended independent claims. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on pages 39-51 of the Instant Specification. Accordingly, to the extent that this rejection applies to the amended and non-amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Oracle does not teach or suggest a method of grouping entries in a directory server for at least the following reasons:

- (i) The Examiner has asserted that Oracle teaches a directory server. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully asserts Oracle is directed to a relational database with no teaching or suggestion of a directory server.
- (ii) The Examiner has asserted that Oracle teaches Class of Service (CoS) using a CoS definition entry and a CoS template entry. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the portions of Oracle cited by the Examiner relate to creating roles in a relational database using SQL. However, the portions of Oracle referenced by the Examiner do not teach or suggest CoS using a CoS definition entry and a CoS template entry as recited in the claims.
- (iii) Oracle does not teach or suggest requiring that a target entry using the CoS is within the scope of the parent of the CoS definition entry.
- (iv) Oracle does not teach or suggest a directory server using a data access protocol (*e.g.*, LDAP)

In view of the above, Oracle does not support the rejection with respect to any independent or dependent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 13220/022001; P5835).

Dated: December 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
Osha & May L.L.P.  
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant